DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 048 CS 205 766

AUTHOR Pferrer, Suzanne
TITLE The Effect of Multiple Revision on Freshman Writing.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 23p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (31st, Washington, DC, March 13-15, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Freshmen; Expository Writing; Higher Education; *Teaching Methods; *Writing (Composition); *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Awareness; Composition Process; *Revision (Written Composition)

ABSTRACT

Student writers should be encouraged to transform their initial writer-centered drafts into reader-based prose with discourse that is developed, shaped, and worded to take the reader's needs into consideration. The main features of writer-centered prose are egocentrism, a form that reflects the writer's thought flow, unexpressed causal relations, undeveloped ideas, little or no evidence in support of ideas, and reliance on code words. Samples of writer-centered drafts exemplify these features. Teachers can take the following steps to help students revise their drafts into reader-based prose: (1) direct the writers' attention to their readers' needs with editing comments that question and suggest additions or with comments that reassign and point out a clear direction for revision; (2) help the writers "see" that the information needed by the reader is not on the page; (3) help writers recognize their code words (words or phrases that have specific meaning to the writer) and encourage them to explore those words, searching for their buried meaning; and (4) encourage writers to role play as their own editor reader, reading slowly, word for word, not skimming. The implications for teaching are that teachers should recognize that writer-based prose is a halfway point for many writers and should be capitalized on. In addition, teachers should arm their student writers with a knowledge of the composing process and should allow them enough time and distance between drafts. (AEA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED191048

The Effect of Multiple Revision on Freshman Writing

Suzanne Pferrer
University of North Carolina
at Wilmington
Wilmington, North Carolina

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Suzanne Pferrer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS205766

"Why didn't you revise?"

"But I did!"

If you've played this scene with a student lately it may be because the compositions we receive from inexperienced writers, although revised several times, are still not completely developed writings that take the reader's needs into consideration. Most composition teachers would agree that such drafts are in a cycle of the composing process where the writer's ideas remain partially in their heads rather than appear on the paper. These versions are writer-based: written for the writers themselves. Although experienced writers often write for themselves first, they do not continue to neglect their readers; they transform their discourse to accommodate their readers' needs.[1] But it is just this step that young, inexperienced writers often omit or ignore.

Composition instructors can help these writers transform their drafts to completely-developed reader-based prose which creates a shared language and context between writer and reader.[2] We can de-emphasize early editing for "correctness" that cuts off composing behaviors and emphasize instead the writer's discovery, development,and expansion of ideas. It would be advantageous to make re-seeing--with a reader in mind--a separate step in the composing process. In this step we can encourage students to decenter or move back from their writing, to try to distance themselves, to try to read as their readers would, learning how to see the omissions or gaps that puzzle a reader. To help our students achieve these insights, we can give

them the time and editing assistance they need, as well as the privilege of revising or rewriting as many times as needed to complete the transformation to reader-based prose. In fact, one of the main objectives of freshman composition could be to sensitize writers to their readers' needs so they understand that revising for their audience is an important part of composing.

Reinforcing the need for a change in instructional emphasis, current composition research studies by Perl, Sommers, and Flower demonstrate that many of our classroom methods are based on models that reflect neither the reality of the composing process nor the writing problems faced by our students.

Sondra Perl's research studied the composing processes of inexperienced student writers who composed aloud. Using an adaptation of Kenneth Goodman's miscue analysis to provide insights into the writing process,[3] the researcher analyzed the number and types of miscues the students made when reading their writing aloud. A miscue could be from "reading in" or deleting words or word endings, reading the desired word rather than the word on the page, and reading abbreviations and misspellings as though they were written correctly.[4] Relying on this data, Perl concluded that the students read from a mental semantic or meaning model that represents their intended meaning. Thus they read in a special way, reconstructing the desired meaning "from the minimal cues on the page," not "perceiving the inaccuracy of the surface features" and not realizing

that their readers "will find these cues insufficient for meaning."[5] Because of this "selective perception," students do not accurately read what they have written. These writers operate as though "what is in their heads is already on the page," literally not seeing omitted information, words, or word endings. This not-seeing is a phenomenon that may explain why so many papers considered complete by student writers are still so incomplete.[6]

From the perspective of classroom experience, we can say if the student writer "sees" an omission, its significance for the reader is often unrealized or dismissed: the missing information is simply not perceived to be necessary. When we call such an omission to their attention, student writers often say, "Everybody knows that," or "I didn't think I needed to put that in." They often can verbally state adequately, even elaborately, what they meant or what, from the reader's point of view, should be on the page. And not only unskilled writers, but average and above-average freshman writers have these problems, differing only in degree. Helping student writers solve such problems, we may simply urge them to revise their writings. In trying to revise, however, they are still literally blind to the existing omissions or flaws. And it may be that we are urging them to begin work again at what appears to them to be an inappropriate point in the composing process, that which they perceive as the end-stage.

Nancy Sommers' study of the revising processes of both students and experienced writers found revising not to be the end stage of composing but a recursive process occurring throughout composing, an integral part

of the entire process. Experienced writers may revise throughout composing, taking the whole writing into consideration, making changes affecting the overall plan, as well as changes in sentences, phrases, and words. Additionally, these experienced writers were able to abandon their self-centered position, distance themselves from their writing, and adapt the role of reader, partly a projection of their own personality,[7] thus reading from a decentered point of view and seeing any omissions or inconsistencies that might disturb or confuse a reader. Therefore, in revising, experienced writers gave their reader's needs first consideration.

Inexperienced writers, like the student writers in Sommers' study, are not only blinded by selective perception but regard revising as only a tidying up or correcting activity engaged in after a writing is completed. At this time students think they are to ferret out "errors" of the types usually thought to enrage English or composition teachers: comma faults, misspellings, incorrect verb tenses, and improper word choices. Sommers' student writers confined their revising to correcting these types of errors or those they saw, their revising operations not extending beyond the sentence level.[8] Therefore, they prematurely edited for correctness and did not revise in the sense of re-seeing their writing as a whole.

From such evidence amassed in both Perl's and Sommer's studies it seems that many composition classroom practices intended to teach revising merely reinforce this error hunting. In fact, work with sentence patterns, such as attempts to tighten or sharpen sentence structure, achieve more

sentence variety, or supply missing transitional links by inserting the traditional coherence words or phrases found useful in expository writing, may be interpreted by students as "revising."

Additionally, the three-stage model of the composing process--pre-writing, writing and revising--further reinforces students' concept of revising as the final cosmetic stage of composing.[9] To combat this, we should not rush student writers toward completion but should encourage them to explore and develop their ideas, concepts, and thoughts. Also we need to encourage the transformation of these early writer-centered drafts from their initial form to reader-based prose--discourse developed, shaped, and worded to take the reader's needs into consideration. For the inexperienced writer, trying to put complex thought into written language may be task enough. The reader is an extra constraint that might wait its turn.[10] Thus, the best composing method for many of our students may be to produce writer-based prose, and then to transform it to make it reader-based through multiple revisions. To accelerate this procedure we can teach students to recognize their writer-based discourse and to reconceptualize it.

Stylistically, the main features of this prose are egocentrism, a form that reflects the writer's thought flow, unexpressed causal relations, undeveloped ideas, little or no evidence in support of ideas, and reliance on code words.[11]

First, being egocentric in the Piagetian sense, inexperienced writers see the world from a single point of view without awareness of other viewpoints or perspectives.[12] They write accordingly, for themselves. Focusing on their own discovery process, they record their own thoughts and actions. The use of personal pronouns in the subject position in most sentences is an obvious clue.[13]

Second, the form is primarily a record of the writer's thought flow, the main ideas emerging as a narrative sequence or survey-tour, its idea structure reflecting or imitating the arrangement of recalled information. Therefore, the organizing principle is dictated by the form of the writer's stored knowledge, not by the purpose for writing.[14] For example, in a recent freshman paper I received, the writer relied on the tour strategy as a useful way to compose a description. Using this method, she could survey her stored memories of a visit to a formal garden, allowing the description to flow along with her recalled movement on foot through the garden grounds (see example). Although this tour or survey strategy is a remarkably efficient method for retrieving information from memory without repeating any of it,[15] such a writer-based description is difficult for the reader to follow. This freshman essay has few signs of any organizational pattern and shows scant effort to represent spatial dimension. The reader must do all the work, supplying the missing connections and relationships.[16] Any vestiges of logical organization are submerged in the fast flow of associations. For instance, as the tour deadends at a

field of freshly-cut grass, the reader is whisked back, via memory flow, without retracing any steps, and set down close to the main garden entrance to begin another leg of the tour, down another path. This device is repeated once again, taking the reader down yet another path to a shelter.

Example 1: Duke Gardens - Visit to a formal garden

> As you are walking through the stone archway of Duke Memorial Gardens you get a sense of feeling as if you were walking around the elaborate gardens of long ago in the 18th century. Descending down the yellow gravel road lined with spring time flowers, there is a strong scent of pine in the air. Standing at the bottom of the stairs that lead from the road are the people with the sounds of laughter and talking that is heard every spring. Here they stand in the circle that surrounds a beautiful stone wall flower bed. The flowers blooming merrily enjoy the warmth from the sunshine. Leading from the circle are two pathways, one leading to the freshly green trees that welcome visitors. The curving and winding path leads you through the quiet woods that are opened up by the noisy birds carrying a tune. Coming across a pond, benches are laid for the tired walker who would rather sit and soak in the beauty of the trees. Upon walking further an open field of freshly cut grass invites the visitor who comes to lie in the hot sun. One other path leads from the circle it is lined with assorted flowers of all types and colors. Halfway up the straightway another path is followed to a shelter that is the memorial ground of Sarah P. Duke.

Third, writer-centered prose often lacks expressed causal relations, developed ideas, and supporting evidence with much of the unexpressed information still needed by the reader. Since writer-based prose has a narrative form, it would seem that a personal narrative might be the easiest form for freshmen to produce, but a writer-centered draft of such an essay also can present difficulties for a reader. For example, a narrative turned in to me as a revised draft was fractured by omissions and crippled by

unexpressed causal relations. On first reading, it was difficult to follow and seemed incoherent. In fact, several years ago, I might have marked it "Incoherent" and returned it. But now I realized that in this essay about the loss of a favorite hunting horse, the writer had ignored the reader's need to share her experiential background of riding to hounds on fox hunts. Thus she left activities, actions, feelings, and emotions unexplained. Neither did she express causal relations: why the horse fell, why it was necessary to shoot it, and so on.

Following are two consecutive paragraphs from this narrative, the first describing the fall, the second, the shooting.

Example 2: Narrative "Memories" (working draft)

> Paragraph 1: We were approaching the road that winds around the lake. While taking time to view the sun sparkling on the large, blue lake. Instantly I felt Sandy fall out from under me. When I looked up, I realized that I had been flung into the grass. As I looked over at Sandy, he was struggling to get up. Quickly, I ran over to assist him. There was no need! His struggle was useless. It was obvious that his right front leg was shattered.
>
> Paragraph 2: When the bullet entered, I instantly lost my breath. At the time, I seriously doubted if I would regain it. My face turned red, and my knees weakened. I fell to the ground beside Sandy, waiting for him to arise. He never did.

After reading the draft, I wrote a brief comment suggesting that the reader needed more information in order to share the experience and asked for a conference. Our resulting discussion, centering on the reader's needs, and a session of one-to-one tutoring in our Writing Center, helped the student produce over several weeks' time, two revisions or transformations and

a final version. In these revisions, the writer filled in omissions, developed ideas, and explained causes, thus making relationships clear. Revised passages for the fall and the shooting follow:

Example 3: Revisions of "Memories" (the fall)

Revision 1, paragraph 1:

> We were now approaching the narrow road that wound around the lake, taking time to view the sun sparkling on the large, blue lake. Suddenly, I felt Sandy fall out from under me. He had stepped in a large hole in the road, covered by a small patch of grass. As Sandy fell, I realized I had to jump off of him so there would be no chance of him crushing me. When I hit the grass on the far side of the lake, I looked over at Sandy. Struggling to get up, he stared over at me with his big sad eyes. Quickly, I ran over and tugged at his bridle, struggling to pull him up, but our effort was useless. It was obvious that his right front leg had been shattered by the fall.

Revision 2, paragraph 1:

> As we approached the narrow road that wound around the lake, we slowed, taking time to view the sun sparkling on the large blue lake. Suddenly I felt Sandy fall out from under me. As he fell I realized I had to jump so there would be no chance of him crushing me. Quickly I gathered all my strength, thrusting upward into the air and recovering as I hit the grass beside the lake. Getting up, I ran over and tugged at Sandy's bridle in an effort to get him up, but our struggle was useless. He had stepped into a large hole in the road, covered by a small patch of grass. It was obvious that his right front leg had been totally shattered by the fall.

Example 4: Revisions of "Memories" (the shooting)

Revision 1, paragraph 2:

When the doctor arrived, I could see him talking silently with my father, discussing the accident. The decision was to shoot Sandy and put him out of his pain forever. When the bullet entered his head, I instantly lost my breath. My face turned red and my knees weakened. Running over to Sandy, I watched him take his last breaths.

Revision 2, paragraph 2:

My father was the first to fully realize what had taken place; he immediately called for a doctor. Later when the doctor arrived, I could see him talking quietly with my father, discussing the accident. My father's face had a confused look, forehead wrinkled and chin drawn. After a prolonged period of discussion, father made his way over to me, explaining that Sandy would never be able to walk again. Even though I understood, I didn't utter a word, only continued to catch the tears as they dripped down my hot, dry face. The decision was to shoot Sandy and put him out of his pain forever. Father seemed to be the only one willing to pull the trigger of the large gun. As the bullet entered Sandy's head, I instantly lost my breath. I felt my face turn red and my knees begin to weaken. Running over to Sandy, I grabbed him and held him while he took his last breaths.

Directing this freshman writer's attention outward to the reader's needs not only helped her see the omissions and realize the reader's need for the omitted information, but served as a heuristic helping her generate the needed material.[17] This, in turn, set in motion a chain of revision operations that engaged her in reconceptions of units larger than the sentence --of paragraphs and eventually, of the whole writing. The final product, although not displaying as much elaboration as might be desired, is no longer a writer-centered narrative composed in the shorthand of interior monologue.

Finally, in writer-centered prose with problems similar to those in this narrative, code words may be used to carry meaning. Code words are a writer's "private cue words," "loaded terms," or "rich bits," accessible sources of original ideas.[18] These words may be "saturated with sense" for the writers, able to evoke for them a complex but unexpressed context, "condensing a wealth of meaning into an apparently innocuous word."[19] Code words can indicate understood but unexpressed ideas and relationships, represent intuited, felt connections, and stand for a cluster of facts, experiences, or ideas. The ideas can be expressed and the relationships explored by having the writers push their own code words.[20] Having them brainstorm, make lists, or freewrite while focusing on these code terms will generate the unexpressed meaning which can then be incorporated into a revision.

To illustrate, a character sketch I received in a freshman class omitted any examples, evidence or support for general statements made or conclusions drawn about the person described. Adjectives seemed to serve as code words apparently covering for unexpressed supporting ideas. In a conference talk with the writer, I pointed out the reader's need to have these named traits demonstrated. The student quickly made notes on this draft. Later when the revision came in with the draft, I saw that he had jotted down one-word notations beside his adjective code words. These notations, code words themselves, served to recall anecdotes he then in-

cluded in his revision to support conclusions about his subject's character traits. Following are excerpts from the working draft with the code words underlined, and the revision.

Example 5: Excerpts, Character Sketch-Mr. Smith

Working draft: I will most remember the philosopher, story-teller side of Mr. Smith, who had a twinkling awareness and nostalgic look. Mr. Smith was either telling of an everyday experience or reminiscing on a happening of his past. I always enjoyed it when Mr. Smith would treat me to one of his experiences of past or present. They popped up at various times during the class period.

Revision: Key word jotted down on draft "badminton"

.....I always enjoyed it when Mr. Smith would treat me to one of his experiences, reminiscing on a happening of his past. I remember the time he told of taking P.E. in college. P.E. was not one of his better classes. As a matter of fact, he flunked it a number of times. He took badminton, the easiest course offered. He said all the students who hated P.E. took badminton and you could tell because the class would be playing outdoors and unlike all the other classes who had P.E. outdoors in the middle of April, everyone in class had a "Brooklyn tan," meaning they were all white as ghosts. I always enjoyed Mr. Smith treating me to one of his experiences of the present or of the past.

Working draft: At times the little devil in Mr. Smith would come out and his personality would be crude, raunchy and somewhat sadistic. But that is how Mr. Smith was, he was very earthy. He did and said whatever he felt, which is actually not all that mean but almost no one else acts this way so it appears to be sadistic to us.

Revision: Key word jotted down on draft --"bowling alley"

At times the little devil in Mr. Smith would come out and his personality would be crude, raunchy and somewhat sadistic. For example, one day we were reading in our grammar book about essays written about our later life goals. Mr. Smith was reading of one freshman who said that he wanted to have a $30,000 a year job, three cars and a large mansion. Mr. Smith said the guy would probably "knock some girl up in his freshman year, then have to quit school and end up working in a bowling alley." That's how he was, a little sadistic, always funny, and very earthy. He did and said.....

I include one more example, a code term appearing in a "revised" draft of a narrative about a favorite sport, volleyball. The code term, "we played for blood" is underlined. My written comment and the resulting revision follow. The transformation in this case is striking.

Example 6: Excerpt from "The Spirit of Sports"

Working draft: During the game we played for blood. My other teammates and myself loved to see our opponents in anguish with their red, sweaty faces, worn out bodies, and eyes full of fear. We did not care how upset they got, just as long as we were leading in score.

Written Comment: This would be much better if you showed your readers how you "played for blood" rather than just telling us -- in other words, expand and develop this part showing us specific words and actions.

Revision: During the game we played for blood. The butterflies jumped in my stomach and the next point had to be scored by my team. The ball was bumped to our side. The center back girl made a bad jump. Our setter had to charge the ball while she looked at me. I knew I would have to spike it and spike it hard. Sure enough, the set was perfectly aimed towards me. As I jumped up many thoughts raced through my head. Should I slam the ball hard or dink it into an open space? I took a split second and glared at my opponent. I knew then what I was going to do. I leaped, got my thoughts together, and slammed the ball with all my strength towards my opponent. She was stunned as the ball pounded hard against her chest. Down she went, along with the ball. We had won. My teammates and myself loved to see our opponents in anguish.....

It is not enough, then for us merely to assign a revision or encourage students to revise. What we will get will not be revisions but re-copied corrections. If we want students to re-see, we must teach them how to transform their writer-based prose. The following are a few steps we can take to help students revise these writer-centered drafts.[21]

First, we can direct the writers' attention to their readers' needs with editing comments that question, suggesting additions to information that is on the page, or with comments that reassign, suggesting a clear direction for revision. In conferences we need to discuss these comments and the need for another draft. We can also explain that needed information has been omitted, how these omissions may puzzle readers, what exactly readers will not understand, and how including the material will clarify ideas, improve communication, and help readers share the writers' experience, emotions and beliefs.

Second, we can help the writers "see" the omissions, trying to convince them that omitted material needed by the reader is not on the page and that their reader should be accommodated. To offset your students' recurring notion that this is just your unique method for getting them to write more, when they have already written adequately, the agreement of fellow students regarding missing information needed by the reader may have more effect on the students' revising efforts than will any lengthy written comments by you. We can use in-class time for group meetings, students bringing their current writing, in whatever stage it is, to class for reader-centered response and comments from peers. The response and comments may be oral or written, but you may find that having a brief editing/response sheet to be filled out and signed by the

readers/editors, then to be turned in for you to check, but not evaluate, will encourage active participation by all students.

Next, to aid a student in expanding a draft by supplying missing information, we can help writers recognize their own code words and encourage them to explore these words, searching for their buried meaning.[21] Inexperienced writers should understand that some words on the page, although very meaningful to them, are not significant to their readers. These words should be pointed out, their meaning questioned in a written comment and/or in a conference. It may be enough to ask, "What do you mean here?" or "What did you have in mind?" or "What did you mean to say here?" In some instances a more thorough discussion may be needed to clarify the writers' ideas. Often, role playing the "dumb reader," as characterized by Walker Gibson, may elicit from the student a full verbal explanation of what was intended. This can be jotted down, the student later using the notes as a memory jogger to encourage further expansion for incorporation into the next draft. This activity also works well with peer group members role playing the puzzled reader. If the writing under consideration is very strongly writer-based, they do not have to be good actors to successfully play this role. As mentioned, brainstorming, making lists of connections and associations, or free writing focusing on code words can also help writers fill in intended meaning by generating that meaning in writing. This information then literally can be inserted at the appropriate points, as the writers of examples 5 and 6 did.

Finally we can encourage students to role play their own editor/reader: have them read what they have written aloud straight through as if they were first-time readers who can see only what is on the page, not what they meant to say. They can imagine their audience listening to them. They should read slowly, word for word, not skimming. Skimming traps students into not-seeing since selective perception then operates, allowing their "inner voice" to "create emphasis, jump over the unclear bits, and fill in extra meanings from memory."[23]

The implications for teaching are threefold. Initially, we should recognize that writer-based prose, although incomplete from a reader's point of view, is not a mistake or error but a halfway point for many writers, often representing the results of an extensive memory search and selection process: it should not be discarded, but capitalized on. Such drafts can be a practical alternative to break the composition process "down to manageable parts."[24] However, we must realize that pointing out errors or flaws, such as an omission, in these drafts is counterproductive unless we help students see the flaws and make specific suggestions for removing them in revising.

Second, we should arm inexperienced writers with a knowledge of the composing process so they can orient themselves and identify where they are as they work on the writing.[25] We should familiarize them with drafts from various parts of the writing cycle written by experienced and inexperienced writers. Students need to be aware that even experienced

writers do not generate the perfect first draft but usually work through a succession of drafts, including writer-based ones. Recognizing their writer-centered prose as a part of the writing cycle will encourage them to expand, develop, and transform it. In this way students will learn that writer-centered drafts are not error-filled representations of their poor writing ability, but foundations on which to build sound structures for their readers.

Third, we should allow novice writers enough time: time to grasp the fact that material has been omitted and time to see the omissions and the flaws, but also the strengths of their early drafts. They need time for consultations with the instructor, for suggestions from both instructor and peer readers/editors, and for visits to the Writing Center if this service is available. We can allot some classes for these activities. Additionally, students need time for multiple revision: time for reconceiving and transforming their drafts for their readers. Sommers' experienced writers claimed they needed "time and distance" between drafts since time allowed them "to <u>see</u> their writing with a more objective eye."[26] Should we ask our inexperienced student writers to perform in ways that experienced writers say they cannot? Should we ask them to revise while they cannot <u>see</u>? It may be that during a semester one or two essays thoroughly transformed to reader-based prose might prove to be a challenging enough assignment. It may also be that most student writing can be done outside

the classroom with flexible due dates in order to accommodate for individual differences in composing and revising.

As Linda Flower's work has shown, writer-based prose can represent a "major, functional" step in composing and can present us with a "powerful strategy" for teaching writing.[27] In addition, it can help us teach our students how to see revising as an integral, generative part of the process. If we perceive that students learn to write by writing, we also may perceive that the learning is in the rewriting.

Endnotes

[1]Linda Flower, "Writer-Based Prose: A Cognitive Basis for Problems in Writing," College English, 41 (September 1979), p. 19.

[2]Flower, p. 20.

[3]Miscue analysis, found useful for studying what students do when they read, assumes that reading is a psycholinguistic process which uses language in written form to get to the meaning. To use miscue analysis for insights into the composing process, the observer analyzes the mismatch that occurs when readers make responses during oral readings that differ from the text. With students composing aloud, Perl studied their encoding behaviors (what they said while they were writing) and their decoding behaviors (what they read aloud after they had finished writing). See Sondra Perl, "Five Writers Writing: Case Studies of the Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers," Dissertation New York University 1978 and "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers," in Research in the Teaching of English, 13 (December 1979), 317-36.

[4]Sondra Perl, "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers," Research in the Teaching of English, 13 (December 1979), p. 323.

[5]Perl, p. 325.

[6]Sondra Perl, "Five Writers Writing: Case Studies of the Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers," Dissertation New York University 1978, p. 331.

[7]Nancy Sommers, "Revision in the Composing Process: A Case Study of College Freshmen and Experienced Adult Writers," Dissertation Boston University 1978, p. 139.

[8]Sommers, p. 156.

[9]Sommers, p. 17.

[10]Flower, "Writer-Based Prose," p. 34.

[11]Flower, p. 25.

[12]Barry Kroll, "Cognitive Egocentrism and the Problem of Audience Awareness in Written Discourse," Research in the Teaching of English, 12 (October 1978), p. 271.

[13]Flower, "Writer-Based Prose," p. 25.

[14]Flower, pp. 15, 25.

[15]Flower, p. 29.

[16]Flower, p. 29.

[17]Linda Flower, "Problem Solving Strategies and the Writing Process," College English, 39 (December 1977), p. 455.

[18]Flower, pp. 455-56.

[19]Flower, "Writer-Based Prose," pp. 21, 32.

[20]Flower, p. 32.

[21]Ideally, we will assume that the original writing task supplies a context or rhetorical situation or allows students to choose their own context, specifying audience, purpose and voice, also perhaps indicating possibilities for publication. Such an assignment helps direct writers' attention away from content toward their readers. An excellent article is Lisa Ede's "On Audience and Composition," College Composition and Communication, 30 (October 1979), 291-95. After briefly reviewing background and current research, she discusses the rationale and methods for structuring such assignments.

[22]Flower, p. 32.

[23]Flower, "Problem Solving Strategies," p. 458.

[24]Flower, "Writer-Based Prose," p. 34.

[25]Perl, "Five Writers," p. 342.

[26]Sommers, p. 142.

[27]Flower, "Writer-Based Prose," p. 34.

References

Flower, Linda. "Problem Solving Strategies and the Writing Process." College English, 39 (December 1977), 449-461.

_____. "Writer-Based Prose: A Cognitive Basis for Problems in Writing." College English, 41 (September 1979), 19-37.

Kroll, Barry. "Cognitive Egocentrism and the Problem of Audience Awareness in Written Discourse." Research in the Teaching of English, 12 (October 1978), 269-281.

Perl, Sondra. "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers." Research in the Teaching of English, 13 (December 1979), 317-336.

_____. "Five Writers Writing: Case Studies of the Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers." Dissertation New York University 1978.

Sommers, Nancy. "Revision in the Composing Process: A Case Study of College Freshmen and Experienced Adult Writers." Dissertation Boston University 1978.